

foreign policy which appeases Russia's every move and ignores the legitimate security concerns of Russia's neighbors. A major aspect of that Russocentric policy is the massive and unconditional aid that we have been pumping into Russia for over 3 years. Continuing to give Russia this assistance despite her increasingly aggressive foreign policy, arms-control violations, statist economic policies, and now her brutal attack on Chechnya sends the message that we approve of these reactionary policies. We need to send the message that we don't approve and that is why I introduced this bill.

Mr. Speaker, no one disputes that a democratic, capitalist Russia that has shed the imperial mentality would be greatly in our interest. The question has always been how, or ever whether, we could help. I have long been skeptical as to even whether we could help, given the transmogrification of Russia at the hands of the Communists, her 1,000-year legacy of autocracy, statism and imperialism, her vast size, her traditional reclusiveness, and of course, the massive and irrefutable failure of foreign aid worldwide throughout the postwar era. However, given the gravity of the situation, even I was willing to support some aid to Russia after Yeltsin and Gaidar embarked on shock therapy in January 1992.

But Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to admit the reality that the reform effort in Russia has failed, and along with it, our aid program. Russia today is not the Russia of 1992 or even 1993, a country racing full speed ahead away from Communism and toward democracy, free markets, and a Western-oriented foreign policy. Today' Russia is one again reactionary.

Let's look at it objectively. Shock therapy was abandoned within weeks of its inception. A purge of economic liberals in the government began in April 1992 and was completed by January 1994. Today, the only liberal in the government is Anatoly Chubais, and he can't even get his subordinates to return his phone calls.

But isn't Yeltsin still a reformer? If so, why then after the ruble crash last September, did Yeltsin replace old thinkers at the Central Bank and Finance Ministry with, well, more old thinkers? The fact is, Mr. Speaker, there are no economic reformers and there is no economic reform in Russia. The history of pouring foreign aid into countries that are not serious about economic reform is a sad one, and it would be folly if we were to ignore this lesson now. When speaking of ways to balance the budget, this is truly a gimme spending cut.

But the story does not even end with the fact that Russia is a black hole and that we need to balance our budget. We must look at this from a foreign policy perspective. Indeed, the whole rationale for our aid program was that it would turn Russia into a better neighbor, right? Well, let's look at Russia's behavior since we started appropriating the billions of dollars.

Russia has vetoed NATO expansion and made implicit threats against Poland and other would-be members. Russia has attempted to subordinate NATO to the OSCE while simultaneously impeding OSCE efforts in Moldova and Nagorno-Karabakh. Russia illegally demobilized thousands of troops in Estonia and Latvia just prior to the troop withdrawal deadline last August. Russia illegally has begun the unilateral demarcation of the Russian-Estonian border. Russia routinely violates Lithuanian

territory ferrying troops and arms to the Kaliningrad region. Russia continues to occupy Moldova with 10,000 troops and enough weaponry for a 200,000-man army. Russia used classic Soviet-style divide-and rule tactics to bring Georgia to heel, and is now preparing to occupy the country militarily. Russia helped depose the democratically elected President of Azerbaijan, Mr. Elchibey. Russia has blatantly interfered in the sovereign commercial affairs of Kazakhstan and Azerbaijan. Russia supports a reactionary Communist regime in Tajikistan which overthrew the legitimate government there in 1992. Recent Russian policies and statements reflect clearly a trend toward, indeed a near-obsession with, the re-integration of the CIS states into some form of Russian-dominated union.

And it goes beyond the former Soviet Union, Mr. Speaker. Russia continues to supply arms to Syria, Iran, and possibly, Serbia. Russia is diligently seeking to emasculate the sanctions against Iraq. Russia is providing economic aid and intelligence information to Castro. On to arms control, it has been known for a long time now that Russia is violating the 1972 Biological Weapons Convention and the 1989 MOU on chemical arms. She is also seeking to wiggle out of the CFE accords, due to take effect in November. As we pay Russia to destroy old and obsolete nuclear weapons, she continues work on a new generation of nukes. And what about intelligence activities? Russia has still not come clean on the Ames spy case and has even provided money to Rosario Ames.

I am nearly out of breath, but unfortunately, I am not done yet. Because I haven't even alluded to the awful events in Chechnya. No matter where one comes down on the question of Russia's territorial integrity, the methods of Russia in Chechnya can only be described as barbaric and despicable. They have razed a city to the ground with indiscriminate aerial attacks. They have wantonly killed woman, children, and the elderly. And finally, the fact that the overwhelming majority of Russian citizens opposed the invasion of Chechnya speaks volumes about the extent of democratization in Russia.

Mr. Speaker, in light of all this, how can we say with a straight face that Russia is a democracy? Is reformist? Is a strategic partner with the West? How can we say that our aid has done any good? How can we paint Russia as a deserving recipient of taxpayer largesse? How can we justify this to the people who sent us here on November 8?

I can't, and that is why I have introduced this legislation. My bill would immediately freeze all bilateral aid to Russia, including previously appropriated and obligated funds, pending Presidential certification to Congress that Russia has met 14 conditions. The conditions pertain to Russia foreign policy, arms control policy, economic policy, and intelligence activities. In order to receive aid, Russia would have to halt the violence in Chechnya, cease interfering in her neighbors affairs, comply with all arms control agreements, limit her intelligence activities to routine, nonadversarial information gathering, end arms sales to terrorist nations, stop aiding Castro, and re-initiate capitalist economic reform.

The bill would also require the executive branch to oppose all multilateral loans to Russia. Both the President and the GAO would

also be required to submit reports to Congress concerning the money we have given Russia to date. The taxpayers have a right to know what happened to this money. There are exemptions in the bill for humanitarian aid, certain exchanges, NED programs, and disarmament funds.

Mr. Speaker, the Freedom and Self-Determination for the Former Soviet Union Act will send a powerful message to Russia that in exchange for American assistance, certain standards of behavior must be met. This will prop up, not undercut, Russian reformers. To date, they have had no good reason to say no to the reactionaries. This policy will help shore up the sovereignty and security of Russia's neighbors. This policy will increase the security of Americans by limiting Russian spying, ensuring Russian arms control compliance, and reducing Russian assistance to terrorist nations.

And if Russia doesn't comply and the aid is cut off forever, it is still a winning situation for everyone concerned. Cutting off aid permanently will enhance the prospects for Russian reform by removing the crutch that has obviated them of the need to make the tough but necessary economic decisions. More importantly, it will save American workers from wasting their money on a country that we cannot save, is doing so little to save itself and is doing so much harm to so many people.

UNFUNDED MANDATE REFORM ACT OF 1995

(Mr. STUPAK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I have serious concerns regarding H.R. 5, the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act of 1995. While I am generally supportive of the need to ease the burden on State and local governments, I do not believe we should rush through legislation that effects our health, safety, and environmental standards without closer examination.

The Great Lakes region, for example, is a fragile ecosystem which depends on the cooperation of its surrounding States. Dumping of sewage or other toxins by one State or municipality significantly impacts the entire Great Lakes region. Pollution does not respect State, geographic or political boundaries. Who then pays for—let's say—airborne pollutants generated in one State, which land in and produce acid rain in neighboring States?

Northern Michigan is a pristine region whose inland lakes are dying from airborne pollutants originating in steel mills in cities such as Gary, IN, and Chicago, IL. Without any Federal safeguards or minimal national standards, which State will take the lead in stopping this air pollution that creates acid rain. And more importantly, which State would pay, Michigan, Indiana, or Illinois? These are questions that must be answered, not ignored in the haste, to create unfunded mandates legisla-